Dear Jim, White 11/28/74

For about a week I've planned to make further comment on your letter of the 16th and some shapr perceptions in it. However, as some of what I've sent you indicates, this period brought tough problems in new form, they had to be coped with, they would have been at best extremely difficult so I finally, perhaps not even consciously, decided to be myself and let the adrenalin flow and the emotion out.

This course held at least the obvious benefit. There may be others. Time holds the answers. However, I am understood well enough for any departure from what for me is normal reaction would prod deeper thought that I anticipate any of this will be given. If there is to be any kind of confrontation or what is not unlikely, ultimatum, then I think the less time the perfidious spend preparing for it the less the likelihood of worse than necessary outcome. I have no personal interest in what eventuates, save that I'd be much better off personally were I to be out of it entirely.

The emotional strain has added to the tiredness. I'd expected to return to writing this a.m. and I got up early for it. Then I saw other things that had not been tended to, including the opportunities to contributing to Ray's understanding (never easy) and a bad situation he may soon face so I decided on that instead, partly because we are going out to Thanksgiving dinner. This would limit continuity in writing. Any my mind has been jerked around too much lately anyway.

I'm glad to have the counsel on the bylon ribbons. When the cheap ones are gone, and I think I have half of one left, I'll try that. Lil's experience with them on her electric and in preparing for offset had turned me off of them. However, those are different problems.

I think it is good for my understanding to have and read pieces like Hunter Thompson's and Fink's. They may in other ways be a waste of time. I think, for example, it probably helped me with Kaiser. I think that went well and if not productive may help avoid some that would be counterproductive. Now in a very short period of time I've had opposite to the past reactions to me from the Village Voice, the Freep and if Kaiser represents Rolling Stone thinking, from it. Certainly from him personally. I do not mean this personalized. I mean it in the sense of the tiny minority I ~~xxx~~ represent and in terms of what they take to their audience. I don't mean the plural. They appeal largely to a fraction of a group, with a minority of others. These have been corrupted in their thinking. So it is helpful. So is it to have read Hinckle's ~~chapter~~, the totality of dishonesty of which makes me wonder even more about him.

I really don't know how much of the Post's position is not influenced by the half-way Hecht-McArthurish Bradlee character. I do think that Harwood was a major part if not only influence and he is out. There have been several elliptical references recently to the departure of one who was described as a problem and he has been shipped up to the new Trenton property. Larry Stern is on some scholarly project. If I can attribute the straight news treatment of the new book (in my opinion downplayed in attention because its news value was and was treated elsewhere as greater) to the end run, that can't account for syndication. I presume the NYPost didn't use the story at all and it is thus not as easy to evaluate the Times' placing, I understand in the financial section. But when it was a second-day story for the Times it did use it, decent space, anyway. And there have been promotions within the Post recently that are not indicative of the influence in question. Sussman has the job he really wanted. He is devoted to polls? I can't comment on some of the other advances. But if I were to make a guess it would have to include some understanding of the import of the deal that led to the Pulitzer and of the national-desk policy that was adverse to success and status if one ignores responsibility and need. At some high level there has to have been comprehension and misgiving. Valentine, by the way, has no resentment over my long letter, thanked me for it and says we have to discuss it. I do not anticipate we will. There is also talk of a weekend party with several of them and their families coming up. As Xmas gets closer I think it less likely, immediately. When the Potomac thing on conspiracies appears I'll perhaps have a clearer reading. The staffer I've never met who was to have been in touch with me has not been. And Maxa solicited a contribution, meaning suggested is for he can't decide and didn't pretend to.

You are at the disadvantage ypu say in not being fully backgrounded on all I send. Aside from the possibility that the comprehensible parts may be of interest there is always the chance that there can be valuable feedback. I am close to isolated now. The only other evaluation I get is Lesar's. Great as he is he is also busy and while quite intelligent and a good clear thinker he lacks experience. I am not reluctant to take fast initiatives if they seem necessary but it is always better to have the benefit of other mature thinking. My own judgement can, I fear, be too easily influenced by the multitude of personal problems. And I don't underestimate the opposition, if this description doesn't seem egotistical. The piggy is the opposition to real power.

The card from Haile is a fascination. He did not send one to Lesar. Why to me? Why this particular wording? Why this timing? If there a relationship between the wording and the timing, that is, the kidding about literary properties about which he has made false accusations with what I am willing to assume, his reading the AP's account of the new book? (If he saw the version I saw in the Times it omitted reference to Lsear. The first copy did not. I introduced it and Sherf included it.) Is he playing cat to an intended mouse? Is he paying a compliment? Is he just having fun? Is he forecasting with an ego compulsion because I've done so much to him? Or is he even telegrpahing, for the odds against his having business or pleasure interests at this particular time in the place that is the center of the Livingston/Fensterwald insanity are that great. The continent holds many places. Unless he has special reason for going to Windsor when he should be preparing his closing argument (unless he completed or delegated it), there are few places that do not hold more attractiveness for R & R.

I have no certain reading on how he reads me. I am inclined to think he he shares the fairly common view that I am a verbose bumbler. But against this he has to know what has been done to him and that a major part of it I did. What I did directly he does know. I believe there was surveillance, including electronic, and that he knows more.

This and what it could mean has been in the remote recesses and I suppose account for some of the vigor of my Bud reactions. One good, whether or not certain, reading on his handling of our criminalist McDonnell is that <u>my</u> room was bugged, for he was well prepared for an improvisation late at night, not at all what I wanted McDonnell for or what I'd asked of him. (Both of these elements Haile ignored entirely in exmaining McD.) Unless in the course of reaching 31 and becoming a lawyer and rising to his present post after working for some of his working, post-degree life for Gore he also became an expert in optics he <u>has</u> to have had information. There are indications there were agents, probably FBI, plus lesser types with and working with him.

He and his Oreo Haynes have to know that I'm the tough one they have to contend with even without surveillance because they have irrefutable readings on all the others. They eliminate, as does my behavior. I gave in on nothing, fought on everything, and succeeded on much and Henry knows it. To the point where he was uncertain what to come up with on delayed discovery, read me wrong and gave us whwt we did not have.

He has overplayed his hand before. Once was the holiday weekend of 10/27, when Haynes over-reacted and called the lawyer with whose wife I'd be walking arms around waists (although we had never met before!) and called him four times the next day before that lawyer was in his office and then questioned unsubtly. With surveillance he knows how long I was in their home. With surveillance he knows I did no partying until he was, in the record, done in. And then he knows with whom I was for he blundered, less than happily, into it. He saw the attitude people like Martin Waldron and Nick Chriss had toward me and he knows whence they come and who they are in their own rights. Probably also that before this we were strangers. He was not a happy man as we walked to our motel together and he knew I was neither drunk nor really feeling a long night of drinking into which he stumbled late. My point is boasting about still being able to hold it. It is that he got many readings, his own, too.

So, while when I finish this it will be out of my mind unless there is reason to recall it and because I believe him to be as bright as he is without scruple, I am intrigued by his writing me alone and letting me know he is in Windsor, our present nut country. One of the possible readings and one of which you can now see that I have taken it this way is as a tip. A forecast to which he is without need and against interest alerting me.

So, I'm fascinated. Partly because I think most lawyers detach their emotions from immediate jobs and partly becsuse I think he does not like me and what I've done. Gotta go.